Confessions of a Mennonite Anthropologist[1]

John M. Janzen, *University of Kansas*

Prologue

Departmental Secretary: "Are you really a Mennonite?"

I (John M. Janzen): "Yes."

Secretary: "So, do you do all those things?"

Janzen: "Yes."

Secretary: "Wow!" as I hurry out the door, late for my class session.

"How does your being Mennonite affect or influence your anthropology?" graduate students asked me on at least three occasions from 2007 on. I told them that I was working on an answer, and still am.

Confessions, in What Sense

These "Confessions" are a belated response to these questions about my being an anthropologist and a Mennonite. I am not confessing shortcomings, but they are more like Saint Augustine's[2] or Jean-Jacques Rousseau's[3] from-the-heart accounts of upbringing, youthful adventures, identity, and beliefs: how the Anabaptist-Mennonite Christian perspective on life may have affected or directed my engagement with anthropology; also, how a career in anthropology may have affected my Mennonite perspective, faith,

and life. This autobiographical approach to characterizing "Mennonite anthropology" is interwoven with a historical sketch of anthropologists (and linguists, folklorists, archaeologists) who have emerged from the Mennonite world, and how they have situated their ethnographic, ethnological, and anthropological activity in relation to their faith and identity.

The final section of this paper presents three vignettes from my career that illustrate the synthesis of my faith and scholarship. The first is about African spirits and African healing, and how I have conceptualized this world. The second is about the most difficult ethical dilemma I confronted in fieldwork, namely with victims and perpetrators of the Rwandan genocide. The third is about interpreting Mennonite society and heritage in a museum setting, doing what has come to be called "auto-ethnography," or "native anthropology."

These lines that sketch a "Mennonite anthropology" stand in symbiotic relationship to the "anthropology of Mennonites." Both terms were used, somewhat loosely and possibly interchangeably, during the "Mennonites and Anthropology" conference in Winnipeg in October 2019.[4]

My Faith Pilgrimage

I grew up in a fairly strict, yet politically liberal, Mennonite family in Kansas in which consistency of word and deed were held high, where loyalty to family and institutions—congregation, conference, schools—were modelled, and where the need for hard work and self-reliance were assumed. My family upheld the historic Mennonite values of separation of church and state which included the search for alternative forms of service to military service. My parents had only a smattering of higher education. Mother graduated from high school, attended college for two years, then nurses' training with an RN degree. Father's formal education consisted of grade school (eight grades in five years), one winter in residence at Hesston Academy (a Mennonite parochial high school), and one semester at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. This did not explain his original outlook on life, and his rich sense of humour. He contended that his "mind was not ruined by education." During several winters in Pasadena and Los Angeles, where his family retreated while hired hands and older sons took care of the farm, father's view of society was transformed by rubbing shoulders with American workers in a big cafeteria where he was employed. This experience was reflected in his constant emphasis

on supporting the "underdog," the down-and-out; he regularly voted for the Prohibitionist or Socialist ticket. Given his sketchy educational background, his only advice for me when my parents drove me to graduate school at the University of Chicago was "finish what you start." He had served twelve years as a member of the Bethel College board of directors, and knew the importance of a tenure-track position if one became an academic.

I was privileged to have instruction in catechism[5] and in college courses[6] that portrayed the Bible as a historical collection of diverse texts, canonized by the Council of Nicaea, under the authority of Constantine's state. My teachers convincingly persuaded me, given the problems of a state church form of Christianity, of the relevance of the Anabaptist understanding of the teachings of Christ, and of the pre-Constantinian early church. These exposures to Anabaptism offered a convincing alternative to the premillennialist fundamentalism and other literalisms that were present in my community. The short although intensive exposure to these doctrines served as a sort of homeopathic immunization against premillennialist fundamentalism, without the scarring experienced by some.[7] Anabaptism as an alternative understanding of Christianity led me to participate in a diversity of congregations and faith traditions: the racially integrated Woodlawn congregation on Chicago's south side; a Russian Orthodox congregation in Paris; various (Catholic, Protestant, prophetic) churches in the Congo; then two dynamic urban fellowships (Montreal and Lawrence, Kansas) that became Mennonite churches. I later developed a deep appreciation of Sufi Islam during years of close association with Khalid El-Hassan and Saadia Malik, exiled members of the Republican Brothers of the Sudan.

Becoming an Anthropologist

I became interested in anthropology while a Pax volunteer with Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) in the Congo,[8] and then, with the encouragement of college professors and peers, followed through with graduate school, field research, and academic positions. I chose the University of Chicago where my academic adviser J. Winfield Fretz had obtained his PhD in sociology, and where my second-year catechism instructor Cornelius J. Dyck did his PhD in church history. In the anthropology department at Chicago I focused on sociocultural anthropology, with Lloyd Fallers as my adviser. Anthropology at Chicago, especially the first year of the MA, was an extremely demanding program including courses in

anthropological linguistics, biological anthropology, and archaeology, in addition to sociocultural anthropology, and history of anthropology. I was at first intimidated by my student peers, most of whom had BA degrees in anthropology from Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and UC Berkeley. I had never had an anthropology course, but my work ethic, Bethel's intensive quarter system with emphasis on writing, my Africa Pax experience, and my courses in philosophy with Harold Gross, stood me in good stead, especially in matters of theory. My thirty-five classmates were an eclectic bunch, nationality-wise (US, British, Austrian, German, Canadian), religious orientation-wise (Jewish, Catholic, native American pueblo, one Quaker, this one Mennonite, and a bunch of agnostics and atheists). I spent my second year of graduate school at the University of Paris where I took a certificate in African Studies with prominent French Africanists, and followed lectures on classical Greek culture with Jean-Pierre Vernant and anthropology with Claude Lévi-Strauss.

In my graduate studies and early post-PhD career I identified a few anthropological role models who had written about their faith. Victor Turner, once a Manchester communist, converted to Catholicism during fieldwork on ritual among the Ndembu of Zambia. Fellow Africanist and Catholic Mary Douglas, an accomplished theoretician of religion, symbolic anthropology and structuralism, penned many anthropological essays on the Bible. There were several Episcopalians, including my adviser Lloyd (Tom) Fallers, from Nebraska, who asked good questions about my Pax service and how it related to anthropology, and Wyatt MacGaffey, fellow Kongo researcher and lifelong friend, who had studied with Edmund Leach and Meyer Fortes at Cambridge, and Michael Smith at UCLA.

Mennonite Identity and "Mennonite Anthropologists"? A Historical Sketch

As I pondered how to tell my graduate students about the influence of my being Mennonite on my anthropology, I determined that I needed to first acquaint myself with other Mennonite anthropologists and how they approached their work, and what difference their faith and heritage identity made. I did not get very far because I could find no writing or published discussions on the topic, short of a few references to mission anthropology in the Mennonite encyclopedias. The list of such individuals I developed over the years revealed that Mennonites had become anthropolo-

gists, ethnographers, folklorists, archaeologists, and linguists in at least the same proportion as in other faith traditions. Yet these Mennonite specialists never formed a self-conscious community of scholars comparable to the very active organizations of Mennonite historians, theologians, music scholars and performers, or medical practitioners.[9]

Perhaps this absence of an organization of Mennonite anthropologists (linguists, folklorists, archaeologists, etc.) reveals a self-marginalization, an outsider complex; or, it may relate to the vexing question of how "Mennonite" is defined,[10] before one can identify who is a "Mennonite anthropologist." Perhaps some of these "Mennonite" anthropologists are our version of the Jewish secular scholar who identifies with a heritage, but is not a person of faith. A further reason for the absence of a Mennonite anthropologists' group may be the wish on the part of these individuals to avoid contributing to "Mennonite exceptionalism," a form of ethnocentrism.[11] I will briefly list some names of individuals who have gone into anthropology who were "raised Mennonite" or grew up in a Mennonite family and community, among them affirmers, deniers, losers-of-their-faith, and the academic equivalent of "the quiet in the land."[12]

The Founders

Let us begin with Wilhelm Mannhardt (1831–1880), nineteenth-century German mythologist and folklorist from Danzig, who studied with the Grimm brothers in Berlin, and who read Edward Tylor's and Adolph Bastian's early works. He conducted a major ethnographic survey of European harvest festivals and rituals[13] that influenced the *Völkergedanken* perspective of Wilhelm Wundt, Adolph Bastian, and James Frazer's *Golden Bough*.[14] Mannhardt was also the author of a history of German Mennonite nonresistance and military exemption, commissioned by the German Mennonite church at the time of the Prussian state's ending of their special privilege. Pieter Jansz (1820–1904) was the first missionary to Java from the Dutch Mennonite Missionary Association at Amsterdam. In preparation for his 1851 travel to the Dutch East Indies he studied geography and ethnology and the Javanese and Malay languages at the Royal Academy of Delft.[15] Over several terms of service the Javanese Mennonite church and community was established, and he created a Javanese Bible translation. Henry R. Voth (1855–1931), from Alexanderwohl community in South Russia and Central Kansas, became an ethnographer-missionary to the Cheyenne and Hopi. He also became a major field researcher

on Hopi ceremonies and altars, models and reproductions of which were exhibited by George Dorsey at the Field Museum in Chicago and published extensively in the *Bulletin of the American Ethnological Society*. Rudolph Petter (1865–1957), Swiss citizen, served as a missionary linguist to the Cheyenne, first in Oklahoma, then in Montana. He researched and published the first Cheyenne dictionary and grammar, and published articles on his work in scholarly journals.

The Mennonite college town of North Newton, Kansas, home of the oldest Mennonite college in the US, produced two "campus kids" who collected arrowheads on Sand Creek and became major twentieth-century American archaeologists. Emil Haury (1904–1992) studied anthropology and archaeology under the mentorship of Byron Cummings of the University of Arizona. In due course he became chair of the department of anthropology at the University of Arizona and the premier Southwest American archaeologist.[16] I met him when he visited North Newton and Kauffman Museum. He asked for clarification of the permanent exhibition's use of "Original People" (in contrast to "Immigrant People") to characterize the Cheyenne. He became a generous patron. Waldo Wedel (1908–1996), fellow campus kid at Bethel, began his college studies at Bethel, then transferred to the University of Arizona. He took his MA degree from Nebraska, and his PhD from UC Berkeley under the mentorship of anthropologists Alfred Kroeber and Ralph Linton, and the ecologist Carl Sauer. He established modern Plains archaeology during his long tenure at the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of Natural History. I met him near Lyons, Kansas, where he was excavating a ceremonial site. The visit was arranged by his nephew, Bethel's mathematics professor Arnold Wedel. Waldo Wedel's wife Mildred was also an anthropologist, specializing in the ethnohistory of Plains tribes.

Missionary Anthropologists

Another very different and distinct cohort of Mennonite anthropologists was active in the twentieth century. I refer to them as missionary anthropologists, working first and foremost to spread the Christian gospel to non-western societies, with linguistics and anthropology providing conceptual and analytical tools to further their primary goals more effectively and humanely. Pieter Jansz, Henry R. Voth, and Rudolph Petter, already mentioned, would fit under this rubric.

Twentieth-century individuals include Jake Loewen (1922–2006), an immigrant from Russia to Canada who became a Menno-

nite Brethren missionary to native groups in South and Central America, especially in the Paraguayan Chaco and Panama. With a PhD from the University of Washington in linguistics, and coursework in anthropology, he became a translation consultant for the American Bible Society and a long-time editor of the leading missiology journal *Practical Anthropology,* in which he published many articles.[17] In retirement he wrote the only anthropological monograph[18] known to me to exist in *Plautdietsch*, the historic vernacular language of the Vistula Delta that accompanied Mennonite émigrés to Russia and North America. Jim Bertsche (1921–2013), MA in anthropology from Northwestern University under Melville Herskovits, had a long missionary career among the Pende of Kasai and Bandundu provinces with the Congo Inland Mission, and authored a major history of this mission and its postcolonial sequel during the turbulent rebellions.[19] Peter Kroeker (1923–2010) was a Canadian farmer who in mid-life obtained his PhD in applied anthropology from the University of Kansas to do agricultural development work in the Congo and in India with Mennonite Brethren missions. Don Jacobs (1928–1920)—Lancaster Mennonite, East African mission worker, urban church planter in New York city, seminary teacher, and first bishop of the independent Tanzanian Mennonite Church—received a PhD in anthropology from New York University based on field research of youth initiation rituals among the Akamba of Kenya.[20] Elmer Miller (1931–2019), with seminary degrees and a PhD in anthropology from the University of Pittsburgh, served as missionary to the Argentinian Chaco. In the course of time he began to doubt his missionary calling, and became a professor of anthropology at Temple University. He systematized his doubts in a major book.[21] Robert Ramseyer (1930–2016), PhD in anthropology from the University of Michigan, was a missionary to Japan with his with Alice. Later he founded and directed the Overseas Missionary Training Program at Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary. Paul Hiebert (1932–2007), PhD in anthropology from the University of Washington, grew up in India where he served as missionary and conducted fieldwork on caste and society. He later taught missiology at Fuller and Trinity Evangelical Seminaries, and authored several books including a major theoretical work on missions and shifting epistemologies.[22]

For all of the missionary anthropologists the primary purpose of studying and applying anthropological analysis in mission and church work was to situate the Christian gospel in indigenous cultural garb. The key word that connotes this aspiration is contextualization.

Academic and Applied Anthropologists of the Late Twentieth Century

The most senior of this cohort would include John Hostetler (1918–2001), professor of anthropology and sociology at Temple University, a widely recognized scholar and author on Amish society, and on the Hutterites with co-author and researcher Gertrude Huntington of the University of Michigan. Hostetler grew up Amish, but became Mennonite when his family moved from Pennsylvania to Iowa. During World War II he was a conscientious objector and served in Civilian Public Service. Carl Jantzen served in an MCC Pax program in Kurdish Iraq, received his PhD in anthropology from Michigan State University, and held a career position in anthropology at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. Later he turned his focus from the Near East to Amish and Old Colony Mennonites in Belize. Carl, as a fellow Bethel College student, was a singular inspiration to me as I contemplated going into anthropology. Byron Good, a Goshen College graduate who did MCC work in Indonesia, received a PhD from the University of Chicago and has a career position in Social Medicine at Harvard Medical School, where he focuses on medical and psychological anthropology in Indonesia. My final and continuing entry in the University of Kansas faculty listing reads: John M. Janzen, "medical anthropology, semiotics, violence, trauma and healing; Central Africa, Euro-American Mennonites."[23]

Other names in this cohort include P. Stanley Yoder (Chokwe of the southern savanna, Africa; public health; career in applied public research, public health program development, and consultancy), Rachel Fretz (African folklore), Rachel Pannabecker (Great Lakes native American textiles and decorative arts; museum studies and practice), Ron Stutzman (1942–2003) (international development, interethnic relations, South America, focus on Ecuador). Erwin Beck, also of Goshen College, has long pursued interests in Mennonite folklore as a professor of English Literature. Paraguayan Mennonite anthropologists Wilmer Stahl (PhD in development anthropology from Syracuse University, and missiology with Paul Hiebert at Fuller Seminary) has continued active involvement in the research on, and shaping of, educational and economic policy of the eight indigenous groups in the Central Chaco, in particular in relation to the Yalva Sanga Teachers Training College. In the 1970s Mennonite anthropologists Walter and Verena Regehr (ethnological training at the University of Basel, Switzerland) did studies on, and were actively involved in policies toward, indigenous Chaco religion and society.

Twenty-first Century Academic and Applied Anthropologists

This cohort is an ever-expanding and diverse group. This short list is surely incomplete, but would include: Janine Wedel (elites in post-cold war Eastern Europe, US elites and power brokers, policy studies); Marcia Good Maust (Latin American women, midwifery, and gender studies); David Schrag (post-cold war German reunification); David Unruh (archaeology, Southwest US); Braden Conrad-Hiebner (museum studies); Kevin Caffrey (Islamic societies of western China); Ben Chappell (critical theory, ethnography, American Studies, Tex-Mex low-rider culture, Mexican-American sports clubs, especially fast pitch softball in communities along the Santa Fe Railroad); Stephanie Krehbiel (ethnographer, American Studies, Mennonite hymnody; focus on gender, sexual violence, church leadership, the culture and power aspects of Mennonite "discernment"); Joyce Burkhalter Flueckiger (South Asian Hindu and Muslim religious traditions); Pamela Klassen (religion in women's lives). These contemporary anthropologists—or other scholars enlisting ethnography and fieldwork—display extraordinary energy and creativity that was also evidenced in the 2019 Winnipeg conference papers.

Parallel vs. Overlapping Magisteria

Mennonites Wilhelm Mannhardt of Danzig and Berlin, Germany, and Henry R. Voth of Alexanderwohl, South Russia and Alexanderwohl and Newton, Kansas, were near contemporaries. They contributed significant work in their respective fields of German mythology and folklore, and Hopi and Arapaho ritual and language, yet they did not correspond nor even know of each other. Nor did their anthropological and ethnographical work and scholarly thought receive the attention of Anabaptist-Mennonite scholarship until recently. Yet both were active members of Mennonite congregations and organizations. Mannhardt was the son of a Danzig Mennonite Church pastor where he remained a member his entire life; he read his father's sermons to the congregation in his father's later years; he researched and wrote a book on the history of German Mennonite non-resistance during the critical debates that took place between the Prussian state and the German Mennonites that resulted in the lifting of the privilege. Voth was a Mennonite missionary to the Arapaho of Darlington, Oklahoma, and to the Hopi of Arizona. He was active in the work of the General Confer-

ence Mennonite Church mission board, and gave many reports and preached sermons about his missionary work.

Mannhardt and Voth may both be characterized as keeping their ethnological work and writing separate, compartmentalized from their involvement in the Mennonite church and even their Mennonite communities. This stance of keeping separate their scientific scholarly persona from their church involvement and faith identity has continued to be a common one for many subsequent Mennonite anthropologists, ethnologists, linguists, archaeologists, and related scholars and practitioners.

On the other hand, there are those—most noticeably among the missionary anthropologists—for whom their faith identity is more important than their scholarly identity. A few of these hide their anthropology. Don Jacobs, famously, writes that when he reported to Orie Miller, MCC executive secretary, that he had completed his PhD at New York University, Miller told him, "Now you've got [your degree], you can forget about it."[24] Only a few of the figures listed have grappled with the implications and nuances of being Mennonite, Christian, and anthropologist.

The juxtaposition of faith and science has been diagnosed and to a certain degree addressed by a few Mennonite thinkers. Professor Owen Gingerich, Mennonite astronomer, cosmologist, and historian of science at Harvard University, offers a helpful formulation. In his book *God's Planet*, Gingerich posits two "magisteria," science and religion, each with its own logic and criteria of truth.[25] The first has to do with empirical observation, comparative examination of evidence, laboratories and instruments, mathematical modelling, and hypothesis testing. The second is about existential truths, belief, hope, security, ethical living, and longing, as well as identity and ultimate reality.

Gingerich suggests that many scientists live and breathe only in the magisterium of science and remain agnostic or atheistic toward the magisterium of religion. For others the two magisteria are both real, in their respective ways, but are kept separate in the lives and thoughts of the practitioners. Gingerich argues, however, that scientists such as himself should realize that the two magisteria have some overlapping existence and that there are issues that require the physicist or astronomer to entertain issues of ultimate reality, of the beginning and ongoing nature of life, and thus of the nature of God. Unlike some of his colleagues, he argues that discoveries in science about the universe enhance his understanding and appreciation of God's creation.

Elmer Miller and Paul Hiebert represent a fascinating contrast among Mennonite anthropologists who have seriously engaged the

entanglements of the two magisteria of their scholarship with their faith. Miller, in detailed autobiographical writing, has identified the context of his zealous beliefs, and then his growing doubts about his calling to be a missionary, and his turning to a career in academic anthropology. The roots of Miller's doubt are plain to see: the simplistic authoritarian answers to life's questions put forward by the Youth for Christ fundamentalists with whom he associated for a time in his teen years. This rigid faith was called into question by his subsequent theological training, and by his mission experience that found much of value in the Argentinian native world he studied and sought to change. What I find fascinating is the way the embrace of doubt provides a foundation for Miller's anthropology. It is almost as if his professional identity is a dialectical opposite of his earlier religious faith. Even my most cynical and secular University of Chicago professors and students did not highlight doubt as a central tenet of their anthropology. Certainly, some prominent anthropologists like David Schneider and Marshall Sahlins switched theoretical paradigms in the course of their careers. But none of them raised it to an almost doctrinal level as did Miller. Might we label him a "fundamentalist doubter?"

Paul Hiebert, on the other hand, constructs a theoretical edifice in which faith and scholarship are in harmony. In his book *Missiological Implications of Epistemological Shifts*[26] Hiebert seeks to establish a method, a way of knowing truth in a modern and postmodern world. After reviewing and critiquing "positivism," "instrumentalism," and "idealism" in the first two chapters, which include both the objective truth of science and the subjective truth of personal experience, he presents his "way ahead" with a stance he calls "critical realism." Critical realism combines both scientific knowledge and subjective experience in an epistemology that is made up of tiered, or multiple and connected, types of knowing. The backbone of this epistemology is Charles Peirce's semiotics of a multiplicity of signs that range from indexical signs to symbols, from fully deterministic referents of the sign's form and meaning to totally arbitrary relationship between the sign's form and its meaning. An example of the first would be the law of gravity; of the latter, the relation in language of sound to meaning. Peirce's semiotics in the hands of a Mennonite missiologist anthropologist leads to the conclusion that all peoples and cultures are of equal validity, that all peoples are equally worthy of God's love, and their cultures provide critical contextual opportunities for harbouring the message of Christianity. The anthropology of universals shines through here, as do the semiotic signs that have objective or abso-

lute truth. A very Anabaptist notion of the "hermeneutic community" is another feature of Hiebert's missiology of critical realism.

The issues raised here over the relationship of science to religion have been addressed extensively in the emerging movement of the "anthropology of Christianity."[27] Anthologies of essays,[28] monograph series,[29] and journal articles are devoted to ethnographies of Christianity both in its historic origins and settings as well as in local societies to which it has spread globally. Inevitably, perhaps, this focus on Christianity has led some authors to turn reflexive in their analysis, suggesting that anthropology could benefit from some of the perspectives and methods used in theology. Joel Robbins, a leading scholar in this field, suggests that contemporary anthropology can sharpen its focus on an "other"—the classic object of study in anthropology—by taking a cue from theology's concern for eschatological imagining and the transformations from one existential state to another.[30] Derrick Lemons examines the common features of ethical reasoning and acting in both disciplines.[31] Of the Mennonite anthropologists cited above, Hiebert represents the most systematic treatment of these issues at the juncture of anthropology and Christianity.

My own anthropological reflections regarding the influences of faith and heritage in my scholarly practice will focus on three autobiographical vignettes, having to do with situations where there are struggles over what is real and what are the boundaries of normality, ethical dilemmas that confront me as a researcher dealing with other human beings, and ways in which I portray my own society to the anthropological profession and to the general public.

Entanglements of the Magisteria: Three Vignettes

Vignette 1: African Spirits, Anabaptist Communion, and Cultural Epistemologies

I do occasionally experience glimmers of transcendence as in a hymn sung in four-part harmony, or a Bach cantata or Mozart's Requiem, or the Russian Orthodox singing in the Paris church near where I lived while a student, or a spirited polyrhythmic drum ensemble in an African healing ceremony. However, although I have seen many individuals go into trance in African healing and worship ceremonies,[32] I have never felt the existential power of African spirits strongly enough to become personally engulfed in possession trance.

My stance has been attacked on the one hand by those who have accused me of a "rather theological approach to African ancestral spirits."[33] In response to my analysis of the observed common occurrence of diviners diagnosing distress and aberrant behaviour as evidence of spirit possession, I was accused by Brian Morris of Goldsmith College, University of London, of being "obsessed with the 'spirit hypothesis.'"[34] This spirit hypothesis refers to the widespread practice of diviners listening to clients' stories of misfortune and then coming up with a diagnosis, or proposal of causation and remediation. For example, diviners or family diagnosticians may suggest that the affliction or misfortune before them is due to a discontented ancestral or nature spirit. This is different from a demonstrative act of trance or possession in a person, or in the substance of a plant. On the other hand, I have also been accused by my former student at McGill, Michael Lambek, now professor at Toronto, of calling into question his phenomenology of spirits on the East African island society of Mayotte as too reductionist, explaining spirit possession by social and economic conditions.[35] In other words, to essentialists like Brian Morris I am a Platonist idealist; to phenomenologists like Mike Lambek, I am a socioeconomic reductionist. Admittedly, I am unmoved by the existential process of trance and possession; I do consider the social and economic context of these spirit rituals. Where they become collective organizations, or *ngomas,* they have a niche ecology in the common distresses of their adherents, for example, women with reproductive troubles, hunters who fail to hit game, traumatized labour migrants who are harassed by the spirits of their overseers and employers, and snake handlers who overcome their fear of vipers.

Only gradually, over decades of scholarship, have I come to see the thread that winds its way back from my stance on African spirits to a formative Anabaptist-Mennonite perspective acquired earlier in life. On rereading a graduate school paper on the symbolic forms of Ernst Cassirer,[36] in searching for a symbolist formulation of culture and truth, I can see the traces of an even earlier imprint of a particular approach to cultural knowledge and symbols in my Mennonite upbringing, catechism, and general reading. Anabaptists rejected the Catholic church's doctrine of transsubstantiation, that the communion elements of bread and wine became the actual body and blood of Christ. The doctrine of consubstantiation, generally attributed to Luther, held that the eucharist elements paralleled, in symbolic association, the body and blood of Christ. In the Anabaptist view of communion, the bread and wine became a sign or ordinance of the body and blood of Christ, the "body of Christ" being the believers' church and its

scriptural—especially the New Testament—teachings.[37] According to Mennonite historian and theologian Cornelius Krahn, in the Netherlands this perspective of the church's stance on rituals of baptism, communion, and other commemorative events like foot-washing, child consecration, marriage and funerals was strongly influenced by Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus.[38] The non-creedal character of Anabaptist theology means that realizing New Testament teaching as a member of a discerning community of believers is more significant than doctrines or "beliefs."

The power of signs and symbols that point to abstract realities and the ethereal beyond offer a more rigorous framework for anthropology than a simple empiricism or functionalist reification of society. In my work on Sub-Saharan African healing orders this perspective helped me understand the difference between possession theory—hypotheses, diviners' proposals—and trance, the manifestation of spirit visitation upon a person or group. Africanist colleagues in the Netherlands used my formulation in a Leiden seminar to share their work on *ngomas* and healing in southern and eastern Africa.[39] The discovery of an Anabaptist epistemology of the sacred in my own thinking would appear to be a particular instance of the more general argument made by Joel Robbins on the relationship of anthropology to theology in the study of Christianity.[40] Anthropology's focus on the ethnographic "other," he suggests, can benefit from the manner in which theology focuses on the other of salvation, ethical principles, and the very nature of the divine.

As my study of African health and healing became more embedded in medical anthropology, I was drawn to the epistemology of signs in the work of Charles Sanders Peirce. Here, signs ranged in their determinative quality from the fully arbitrary symbols of language to the insistent, almost instinctual, indexical signs of unconscious physiological synapses.[41] Imagine my surprise to discover in Paul Hiebert's formulation of mission anthropology in a postmodern era the semiotics of Peirce.[42] Was this concurrent use of an expansive semiotics by two theory-seeking Anabaptist anthropologists a coincidence? Or was it co-determined by the foreground of symbolic sacraments in a believers' church against a backdrop of God's unwavering love and power?

Vignette 2: Ethics in Fieldwork

Of the numerous instances and diverse settings of fieldwork in which I have engaged, I will feature one where the challenges were most significant and the decisions I drew may well have re-

flected my Anabaptist-Mennonite perspective. In 1994 my wife Reinhild and I joined an international MCC unit in the African Great Lakes region, to minister to and collaborate with multiple service agencies in Rwanda, eastern Congo, and Burundi. MCC co-sponsored four refugee camps in eastern Congo, distributed food and seeds within Rwanda, conducted mediation services among Rwandans and Burundians, and worked with Burundian Quakers in their schools and posts. Engaged as multi-purpose relief workers and anthropologist and art historian respectively, we were invited to interview as many people as possible to discern the causes, consequences, and solutions to the multiple problems of the region. In the course of two months we interviewed over seventy individuals and groups in Rwanda, eastern Congo, and Burundi where MCC had projects going. Our international unit facilitated contacts to members in the camps of refugees, internally displaced persons, leaders of these groups and home communities, relief workers, politicians, professionals, pastors, diplomats, and others. The terms of the interviews and less formal conversations were guided by codes of ethics within MCC and anthropology. These included the transparency provided by our introductory statement of who we were, that we were university professors in short-term assignments with a relief and development NGO. Usually we would ask for volunteers, or our team leader, Harold Otto, himself a veteran MCC worker called back from graduate studies in international relations at Harvard's Kennedy School, would sometimes make contacts for us and set up the interview. To our surprise, most contacts were eager to tell us "their story" and some even sought us out to share their story with us. These stories invariably included their encounter with life-threatening violence, what happened in the moments or days of this experience, how they dealt with that situation, and how they fled, saved their life, and got to their present situation. Often they asked us to "tell the world" so that others would know what had happened and the world would learn so as to avoid it ever happening again. We would ask further questions to fill in background, their life story in brief, and ask what they wished their leaders and the international community to do about the situation. We asked for permission to publish their story; almost all agreed, indeed, begged it be published. This unusual context stretched the limits of fieldwork ethics.

In the process of compiling and publishing articles, and eventually a book of our findings,[43] we needed to come to terms with the fact that our interlocutors had been from across the spectrum of the war and genocide's survivors, victims (even after we had interviewed a few), perpetrators, and those who were both perpetrators

and survivors of violence. A brief description of the ethical dilemma we faced had to do with the conflicting constructs of reality shaped by the political struggle that was playing itself out in the Great Lakes. The Rwandan Patriotic Front that had taken over the country from the former government of Rwanda was publishing names of organizers and perpetrators of the genocide on a website. Various human rights NGOs were likewise publishing names of victims. Even as the United Nations troops that occupied the region were trying to keep the peace, scores were being settled by smaller raids or larger-scale actions on the part of both Rwandan armies and the opposing forces in Burundi. We were somewhat aware of the vulnerability of those whose names we might publish. However, along with the Rwandan Patriotic Front and human rights organizations, there was widespread interest in identifying and holding accountable the perpetrators of the genocide.

After we left the Great Lakes region and began to give public lectures, present professional papers, and publish our material, we used the rule of thumb I had developed in my earlier anthropological writing: name and identify public figures, holders of public office, and render anonymous private individuals or those whose safety might be endangered by published identification. This meant that we needed to figure out somehow whether those individuals who had begged us to "tell the world" might be endangered should we identify them by name. Some of the stories included amazing accounts of bravery in which members of one side had rescued their neighbours, family members, or total strangers on the other side, and hidden them or managed their escape. We heard remarkable stories in which victims of violence forgave the perpetrators, based on simple human empathy, or Muslim and Christian moral grounds.

Prior to publishing our main book *Do I Still Have a Life? Voices from the Aftermath of War in Rwanda and Burundi*, we shared our manuscript with a Rwandan professor in exile in the United States who agreed to go through it carefully to identify those persons who should be identified by name, and those who should be made anonymous, given pseudonyms, or otherwise camouflaged. So far, I am unsure whether these actions taken to "do no harm" and to achieve the desired understanding of the events in the Great Lakes are taken from anthropological or Christian/Mennonite ethical codes. Getting the story right, avoiding reinforcement of stereotypes, would be anthropological. Featuring stories of remarkable bravery and forgiving your enemy or someone who tried to harm you, would perhaps reflect values of religious redemption. In a few cases our interviewees were obviously perpetrators of the genocide; we tried

to understand their rationale for their stories of self-justification. Others who had been drawn into killing to save their own lives were the most complex and pathetic cases we encountered; we needed to unravel their emotional, moral, and psychic ordeal. In other cases, we were drawn into counselling them in their nightmarish anguish. Anthropological engagement gave way in these cases to comforting. Others were struggling with fear and depression, raising questions such as: Should they seek exile and life in another country? Would they ever be able to return to their homes? Again, engaged listening and counsel were the main stances we took.

Writers on professional ethics have tried to outline guidelines for action in relation to the occupation or discipline. Joseph P. Martin, a Mennonite medical doctor and brain disorder and genetics researcher, writes that his Anabaptist-Mennonite identity serves him best in the ethics of individual care and how to approach ambiguous issues of gene splicing and therapy.[44] For a Mennonite anthropologist facing the issues described here, the science is not so clear, but the imperative to do no harm, to ennoble those who have suffered, and to hold accountable those who have violated others' rights—to feature stories of redemptive action—all seem helpful courses of ethical action where the magisteria of anthropology and Mennonite faith find harmonious resonance.

Vignette 3: Mennonite Native Anthropology—Us as Other

A number of Mennonite anthropologists have researched and written about Anabaptist-Mennonite society, culture, and religion: Wilhelm Mannhardt on conscientious objection to military service and German governmental exemptions; John Hostetler on Amish and Hutterites and the state; Carl Jantzen on Old Colony Mennonites; the missionary anthropologists on missions and the church. Yet few have reasoned out explicitly what is or might be the relationship of anthropology to the portrayal of Anabaptist-Mennonite society. It appears that we anthropologists have simply let the sociologists and historians take charge of this effort. Yet, in the face of a growing trend of native anthropology, or auto-ethnography, it seems opportune to identify the guidelines and themes that would govern such an activity. In this third vignette I will summarize the general lines, and offer a particular instance, of my own work in such native anthropology.

Despite the critique of "Mennonites as *Volk*" (a subset of Germans, as seen by Mannhardt),[45] the self-identification of Mennonites remains somewhat muddled. Current Mennonite Church USA

usage seems to allow for the designation of African American, Native American, and other minority Mennonite populations as ethnic groups, while the mainstream is not referred to as "ethnic." Some writers and conference organizers use "German" or "Swiss" to describe this mainstream in terms of ethnicity.

The reality of cultural pluralism is overwhelming in several projects in which I have been involved that interpret Mennonites to themselves and the wider world. This was true in the sixteenth century when Anabaptism sprang up as a movement across much of Western and Central Europe, and it continued to characterize the settlements that took shape wherever the scattered could find refuge. It was true of the regions and communities that were founded by secondary migrations to diasporas in Asia and the Americas.[46] It continued to be true in the mission churches and communities that developed all over the world.[47] It is visible in the composition of the Mennonite World Conference, and in the far-flung presence of MCC,[48] and is true of almost any urban Mennonite church or fellowship in the twenty-first century. The literature that has emerged within Mennonite scholarship on pluralism, ethnicity, and religious identification is too vast to review here.[49]

The pluralism of identity and cultural forms referred to here was incorporated into the permanent exhibition at Kauffman Museum in Kansas, created in the 1980s while I served as director. A small slice of this work is presented here as an illustration of interpretive anthropological analysis in a Mennonite setting. The broader global pluralism of Mennonites is portrayed in a world map, migration stories, and a section on "Encounters across Cultures" that features Mennonites interacting with peoples of Central Africa, India, and China, as well as the Cheyenne. The exhibition on Mennonite origins and the congregation focuses on particular settings. In the section on worship, part of "Mennonite Life," three recordings of Mennonite congregations may be heard. The first selection is an Old Order Amish group singing from the *Ausbund*, the sixteenth-century hymnal of mostly martyr ballads; the second selection is of a hymn sung in four-part harmony by a General Conference Mennonite congregation, with music that could have been composed by Handel, or Beethoven; the third is of a Congolese Mennonite Brethren congregation in Kikwit, Democratic Republic of Congo, singing and dancing poly-rhythmically to the accompaniment of an *ngoma* spirit drum. The viewer is left with the impression of astonishing variability in Mennonite music, each form as valid as the next. Although nowhere spelled out explicitly in written text, the theory behind this exhibition segment is that if

there is unity in the Anabaptist- Mennonite family, it is in the ideas and the community, not in the genres of artistic expression.

A similar perspective in the relationship of form to meaning emerged in my research and discussions of Mennonite worship sites. At stake were the fates of two historic buildings that had served congregations: one, the eighteenth-century Germantown meeting house; the other a late nineteenth-century century adobe meeting house at Inman, Kansas, built in the style of earlier Ukrainian Mennonite buildings. An international conference brought together historians, architects, theologians, and those associated with historic buildings and their interpretation to seek to understand the meaning of these buildings by exploring the theological, historical, built-form, and spatial dynamics of congregational worship.[50] Many presentations suggested that although there was a traditional form of Mennonite group worship that featured face-to-face seating of participants, and a central placement for the reading of scripture and the presentation of sermons, the meeting-house or prayer house was not considered to be a sacred building or space, per se. Indeed, initially Anabaptists had met in caves, barns, homes, and outdoors before they were allowed to have official sites of meeting. The tradition of meeting house or prayer house with its face-to-face form came about as an expression of a non-hierarchical understanding of Christian community rather than a theological tenet. In the course of economic success and cultural assimilation, many Mennonite congregations readily adopted the basilica or church form of worship with a "high altar" at the front of the sanctuary. Only after a generation or two of typical Protestant church buildings, and the emergence of reflective, historically trained, Mennonite architects, did the appropriateness of a face-to-face seating arrangement become implemented in some new Mennonite church buildings.

The significance of these developments to cultural theory were formulated in the section "On the association of form to meaning" in the introduction to the *Mennonite Quarterly Review* special issue.[51] In Anabaptist thinking and theology, it is the gathered community that is sacred, the body and blood of Christ, not the building. Therefore, the most apt shape of worship is the face-to-face community, rather than a high altar at the front of a forward-facing congregation, with its focus on the eucharist, in Catholic doctrine held to be the actual body and blood of Christ. In sum, the Anabaptist understanding of the relationship of built form to worship function and meaning is one of contingency, rather than necessity. A face-to-face arrangement is the apt form for worship, but it is not doctrine-determined.

Conclusions

Is there then a "Mennonite" anthropology? Can there be? Should there be? Scrutiny of the scholarship and self-presentation of these scholars suggests a peculiar stance toward their Mennonite background and identity, a kind of silence, a tacit denial or embarrassment, about who they are. I have identified this as the "quiet in the land" syndrome, harking back to centuries of Mennonite self-imposed invisibility thought by some to be the scar of sixteenth-century persecution and flight. Furthermore, notwithstanding the short-lived association of Anabaptist Sociologists and Anthropologists in the 1990s to 2003, these anthropologists—who grew up in Mennonite homes, attended Mennonite colleges, worked in Mennonite institutions, or held positions outside of the Mennonite world—have never organized into a self-conscious association, as have Mennonite historians, medical professionals, business people, educators.

With the exception of those I called "missionary anthropologists," these "Mennonite" anthropologists have pursued careers for all intents and purposes similar to their secular peers. The specializations they tackled and the career interests they pursued are all over the map of anthropological, linguistic, and folkloric studies. They have been successful in their careers, and some were innovators in their fields, highly regarded by their peers. It is not surprising that the values of integrity, hard work, persistence, and community sociability found in their upbringing should be carried forward into their careers. Several readers of earlier versions of this paper wrote that we do not need a Mennonite anthropology. We need good anthropological analyses on current and historical Anabaptist-Mennonite communities and on the issues surrounding their being-in-the-wider-world.[52]

In my examination of my own career as anthropologist and Mennonite I have singled out three examples of faith/culture/heritage influence on my work. First, the epistemology of my approach to culture, religion, ritual, health, and society is rooted in the Anabaptist-Mennonite symbolic stance of the eucharist and the ordinances of baptism, foot washing, love feasts, and service. These are but signs of the "body of Christ," which is the transformed community of adult believers, rather than the literal flesh and blood of a historic figure whose teachings we try to follow. Second, the ethical principles that I practice, especially in my fieldwork and research, and perhaps in teaching and life in general, are expressions of my faith-derived convictions. They overlap with professional ethics and plain common sense. Third, in my

work on Mennonite cultural traditions, largely done in connection with a season of museum work and historical building conservation and interpretation, I have come to emphasize the pluralism of Mennonite society, and the pluralism of cultural forms. This pluralism is in fact a collective expression of the contingent—rather than deterministic—relation of form to content in music, architecture, institutions, and relief work and outreach of all kinds. This last tenet of a Mennonite anthropology mitigates against fixed forms, ethno-nationalistic identities, and prescribed boundaries of "us versus them."

The creativity that we witnessed in the twenty-eight presentations at the 2019 conference in Winnipeg is abundant evidence of an anthropology of Mennonites. The emergence of a self-conscious Mennonite anthropology, if and when it occurs, to the extent to which it occurs, will feature as much diversity as anthropology in general, with subtle tones and emphases that suggest the values of our Anabaptist-Mennonite faith and heritage.

Notes

[1] This paper was presented, in part, at the conference on "Mennonites and Anthropology: Ethnography, Religion, and Global Entanglements" sponsored and hosted by the Centre for Transnational Mennonite Studies at the University of Winnipeg, October 24–25, 2019. The conference was so rich and expansive that it is impossible to do justice to all the connections and elaborations that relate to this paper. References in this revised paper to presentations and discussions of the conference are necessarily limited to occasional additional lines or endnotes.

[2] Saint Augustine, *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (New York: Image Books, 1960).

[3] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Confessions* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1930).

[4] Philip Fountain, co-organizer of the conference, referred to these two profiles as "anthropologists who come from Mennonite backgrounds" and "anthropologists who have researched Mennonite communities." See his "Fragments of a Mennonite Anthropology," typescript, October 24, 2019, Winnipeg.

[5] Rev. Henry J. Dyck and Rev. Cornelius J. Dyck, at Zion Mennonite Church, Elbing, KS.

[6] I was taught by professors Edmund G. Kaufman, former missionary to China, PhD in history from the University of Chicago; Erland Waltner, later president of Mennonite Biblical Seminary; Honora Becker, English literature; and Harold Gross, philosophy.

[7] "God's Plan for the Ages: Daniel and Revelation," term paper for a course on biblical prophecy, Berean Academy, 1954. The course and my paper were a recital of the premillennial teachings in which the "end time" features a thousand-year reign of Christ before the anti-Christ is ultimately

vanquished. I received an A- because I dutifully parroted the doctrine propounded by the teacher Daniel J. Unruh.

[8] Described in John M. Janzen and Larry Graber, *Crossing the Loange: Pax Service and the Journey Home* (Newton, KS: Mennonite Press, 2015), and in a blog at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307510429_My_Young_Self_as_Other_Anthropological_Reflections_on_Crossing_the_Loange.

[9] The closest we came to such an entity was the Anabaptist Sociological and Anthropological Association which issued an irregular newsletter from 1993 until 2000 and sponsored a few conferences, including one on Anabaptist ritual at Hillsdale College in 2003. The ASAA business meeting that occurred during the conference was dominated by sociologists and theologians. Initiatives to publish the papers fizzled.

[10] Definitions of Mennonite have varied wildly, depending on context and who is doing the defining. The Mennonite World Conference and Mennonite Church USA track membership based on those who received adult baptism. My former colleague Michael Crawford, a biological anthropologist, defined the Mennonites he studied as their gene pool, of greatest interest being historic pockets of inbred populations. In a panel on Mennonite aging at the American Anthropological Association meetings in 1989, I tried to sort out these issues in my paper "Problems, Paradoxes and Potentials in the Anthropological Definition of 'Anabaptist-Mennonite Populations.'" A Russian Mennonite who had just migrated to Germany was surprised that in America Mennonites worship in English; to him one needed to be German-speaking to be Mennonite. A Mennonite lay minister in an Orenburg, South Urals, congregation in 1990, when asked if Russians could join their Mennonite church, suggested that "no, if they joined, and were baptized, they would still be Baptists." Philip Fountain, in his opening remarks to the 2019 "Mennonites and Anthropology" conference, confirmed the paradoxical juxtaposition of the absence of a Mennonite anthropological group or consciousness, alongside the "vast literature" on Mennonite identity, ethnicity, and religion.

[11] Suggested to me by anthropologist Michael Reinschmidt, director of Kauffman Museum, after reading an earlier draft of this paper.

[12] Derived from the German phrase *die Stillen im Lande*, it refers to Mennonites who remain quiet about their identity and faith, an attitude thought by some to derive from the persecution of earlier centuries, flight, and refuge in states that allowed them to live if they would promise not to propagate their faith.

[13] Wilhelm Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte* (Berlin: Walter Heuschkel, 1875).

[14] Mannhardt's place in the early history of anthropology has recently been enhanced by articles such as Tove Tybjerg's "Wilhelm Mannhardt — A Pioneer in the Study of Ritual," in a special issue of *Scripta Instituti Donnerioani Aboensis* 15 (1993), and Frederico Delgado Rosa's "Avant *Le Rameau d'Or*: biographie de Wilhelm Mannhardt, précurseur oublié de James Frazer" in *Bérose – Encyclopédie internationale des histoires de l'anthropologie* (Paris: IIAC-LAHIC, UMR 8177, 2018), http://www.berose.fr/article1241.html. Reviews of Mannhardt's life and work that seek to integrate his professional and Mennonite scholarship include Braden Conrad-Hiebner, "Reintegrating the Life of Wilhelm Mannhardt, A Nineteenth-Century Mennonite, Mythologist, Nationalist, Pietist, and Liberal" (Social Science Seminar Paper, Bethel College, KS, 2007), and Mark Jantzen's 2011

entry in *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online* (GAMEO), s.v. "Mannhardt, Wilhelm," https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Mannhardt,_Wilhelm_(1831-1880).

15 Wikipedia, s.v. "Pieter Jansz," https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pieter_Jansz.

16 Haury's contribution to southwestern archaeology was memorialized in J. Jefferson Reid and David E. Doyel, eds., *Emil W. Haury's Prehistory of the American Southwest* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986).

17 Jacob A. Loewen, *Culture and Human Values: Christian Intervention in Anthropological Perspective* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1975).

18 Jash Leewe [Jacob A. Loewen], *Onze ieashte Missjounsreiz* (Winnipeg: Mennonite Books, 1997).

19 Jim Bertsche, *CIM/AIMM: A Story of Vision, Commitment and Grace* (Elkhart, IN: Fairway Press, 1998).

20 Donald R. Jacobs, *What a Life! A Memoir* (Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2012).

21 Elmer S. Miller, *Nurturing Doubt: From Mennonite Missionary to Anthropologist in the Argentine Chaco* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

22 Paul G. Hiebert, *Missiological Implications of Epistemological Shifts: Affirming Truth in a Modern/Postmodern World* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999).

23 "John M. Janzen | Department of Anthropology," University of Kansas, updated August 17, 2019, https://anthropology.ku.edu/john-m-janzen.

24 Jacobs, *What a Life!*, 155.

25 Gingerich borrows this formulation from the late Steven Jay Gould, at the time in the 1980s president of the American Academy of Science, involved in advocating for evolution following a 1981 trial regarding the teaching of creationism in schools. Gould advocated for non-overlapping magisteria of religion and science. Owen Gingerich, *God's Planet* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 4–5.

26 The volume is published in the series Christian Mission and Modern Culture, edited by Alan Neely, H. Wayne Pipkin, and Wilbert R. Shenk.

27 Philip Fountain, in his opening comments of the Winnipeg conference, opined that the anthropology of Mennonites would clearly offer an instance within this wider rubric.

28 Fenella Cannell, ed., *The Anthropology of Christianity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

29 See the Anthropology of Christianity series at the University of California Press, edited by Joel Robbins.

30 Joel Robbins, "Anthropology and Theology: An Awkward Relationship?" *Anthropological Quarterly* 79:2 (2006): 285–294.

31 J. Derrick Lemons, ed., *Theologically Engaged Anthropology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2018).

32 See for example John M. Janzen, Lemba, *1650–1930: A Drum of Affliction in Africa and the New World* (New York: Garland, 1982); Janzen, Ngoma*: Discourses of Healing in Central and Southern Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

33 Brian Morris, "Medical herbalism in Malawi," *Anthropology and Medicine* 18:2 (2011).

[34] Brian Morris, *Wildlife and Landscape in Malawi: Selected Essays on Natural History* (London: Trafford, 2009), 255; referring to Janzen, *Ngoma*, 92, 143, 145.

[35] Michael Lambek, "Reply to Janzen," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 21:1 (1984): 118–119.

[36] "Symbolism as a matrix for the study of culture: An adaptation of the philosophy of Ernst Cassirer," Term paper for Anthro. 341, Society and Culture, Prof. David M., Schneider, University of Chicago, Winter 1962.

[37] Robert Friedman, "Lord's Supper, Anabaptist Interpretations," in GAMEO, 1957, https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Lord%E2%80%99s_Supper,_Anabaptist_Interpretations. I am indebted to Ray Reimer for pointing out the distinction between Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation and Anabaptist perspectives. For a fuller and more nuanced account of Anabaptist views of the eucharist and ordinances, see John D. Rempel, "Communion" in GAMEO, 1990, https://gameo.org/index.php?title=Communion.

[38] Cornelius Krahn, *Dutch Anabaptism: Origin, Spread, Life and Thought (1450–1600)* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968). See especially Chapter III, "The Evangelical Sacramentarian Reformation," 44–79.

[39] Rijk van Dijk, Ria Reis, and Marja Spierenburg, eds., *The Quest for Fruition through* Ngoma*: The Political Aspects of Healing in Southern Africa* (Oxford: James Currey, 2000). See especially my Afterword, 155–168.

[40] Robbins, "Anthropology and Theology."

[41] John M. Janzen, *The Social Fabric of Health: An Introduction to Medical Anthropology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001).

[42] Hiebert, *Missiological Implications of Epistemological Shifts*.

[43] John M. Janzen and Reinhild Kauenhoven Janzen, *Do I Still Have a Life? Voices from the Aftermath of War in Rwanda and Burundi*, University of Kansas Publications in Anthropology 20 (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, 2000).

[44] Joseph P. Martin, medical researcher of brain disorders and genetics, formerly of McGill University, University of California, San Francisco, and more recently of Harvard Medical School, in *Reflections on Science, Religion, and Society: A Medical Perspective*, (Victoria, BC: Friesen Press, 2017).

[45] Benjamin Goossen, *Chosen Nation: Mennonites and Germany in a Global Era* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017), 38–42.

[46] Jim Juhnke, *Dialogue with a Heritage: Cornelius H. Wedel and the Beginnings of Bethel College*, Cornelius H. Wedel Historical Series 2 (North Newton, KS: Bethel College, 1987). See particularly Ch. I, "The Ethnic Dialogue," 9–25, where he details the diverse strands of Bethel's constituency and how they strove to come up with an institutional identity that was larger, more inclusive, than any one of their particular traditions.

[47] Don Jacobs, *What a Life!*, 203–207, describes in vivid detail the struggles of the East African Mennonite church to transcend the ethnic divisions—between Nilotic and Bantu speakers—that emerged with independence, and his election as the first bishop of the independent Mennonite church because of his outsider role. His African successors aspired to an ethnically pluralistic identity of the church.

[48] See Alain Epp Weaver, *A Table of Sharing: Mennonite Central Committee and the Expanding Networks of Mennonite Identity* (Telford, PA: Cascadia, 2011).

[49] A highly selective sampling of this literature includes John A. Lapp, "The Global Mennonite/Brethren in Christ History Project: The Task, the Problem, the Imperative," *Conrad Grebel Review* 15:3 (Fall 1997): 283–90; Benjamin W. Goossen, "Mennonites in Latin America: A Review of the Literature," *Conrad Grebel Review* 34:3 (Fall 2016): 236–265; Royden Loewen, "The Politics of Peoplehood: Ethnicity and Religion Among Canadian Mennonites," in *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada*, ed. Paul Bramadat and David Seljak (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 330–364.

[50] "Bethaus, Meetinghouse, Church: An Historical Inquiry into the Architecture of Anabaptist-Mennonite Worship Spaces and Places," October 16–18, 1997, co-sponsored by the Mennonite Historians of Eastern Pennsylvania and the Germantown Mennonite Historic Trust.

[51] John M. Janzen, "Anabaptist-Mennonite Spaces and Places of Worship," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 73:2 (April 1999): 151–165.

[52] Intended as a tip of the hat to all my phenomenologist friends and colleagues.